

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32
March 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

RESPONSE TO NOTICE TO ADVISE OF SCHEDULING CONFLICTS

CORRECTED

Case Number: 22-2288Short Case Caption: Apple Inc. v. Corephotonics, Ltd.Party Name(s): Corephotonics, Ltd.

INFORMATION: The court uses this form to determine whether and when to schedule cases for oral argument. Arguing counsel may be changed later, but a motion to reschedule is required once the court schedules argument. Please plan in advance to adhere to the limit on the number of arguing counsel in Fed. Cir. R. 34(e).

Argument Waiver ☐ My party intends to waive oral argument.

NOTE: Filers checking this box must still complete the below sections. **The court may still schedule this case for oral argument even if any party intends to waive argument.** If scheduled, parties may still elect to waive argument using the response to notice of oral argument form.

Other Parties Representing Interests

☐ Counsel for another party will represent my party's interests at oral argument

NOTE: If this box is checked, skip the remaining sections. Any argument date will be selected based on conflict dates for counsel arguing on behalf of your party.

Name of Expected Arguing Counsel	Brian D. Ledahl
---	-----------------

Dates Unavailable

Do you have dates of unavailability within the specific sessions identified by the court's Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts in your case?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing **up to ten dates** of unavailability and **include a statement showing good cause for each date.** Dates without good cause or that do not pertain to arguing counsel (e.g., client conflicts) will not be accepted. The court will only accept dates for one counsel and only if that counsel has filed an entry of appearance. The Clerk's Office will evaluate and note accepted or rejected conflict dates; counsel may contact the Clerk's Office about re-filing if dates are rejected. See Fed. Cir. R. 34(d); Practice Notes to Rule 34.

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32
March 2023

Potential Case Conflicts

Are there other pending cases before this court (regardless of case status) in which expected arguing counsel in this case also expects to argue?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing those cases.

I certify the above information and any attached statement is complete and accurate. I further certify that I will update my notice should new conflicts arise or existing conflicts change.

Date: 8/22/2023

Signature: /s/ Brian D. Ledahl

Name: Brian D. Ledahl

Save for Filing

NO. 22-2288

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

APPLE INC.,
Appellant
v.

COREPHOTONICS, LTD.,
Cross-Appellant

On Appeal from the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in
Inter Partes Review No. IPR2020-00489

STATEMENT OF GOOD CAUSE

The undersigned hereby states that good cause exists for each of the scheduling conflicts identified in Cross-Appellant Corephotonics, Ltd., Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts as follows:

October 2, 2023

Final Pretrial Conference in
Almondnet, Inc., et al., v.
Amazon.Com., Inc., et al., Case No.
6:21-cv-00898-ADA

October 4-6, 2023

Claim Construction Hearing in case
Corephotonics, Ltd., v. Apple Inc.,
Case No. 3:17-cv-06457-LHK
Northern District of California.

Dated: August 22, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian D. Ledahl

Marc A. Fenster

mfenster@raklaw.com

Brian D. Ledahl

bledahl@raklaw.com

Neil A. Rubin

nrubin@raklaw.com

James S. Tsuei

jtsuei@raklaw.com

Russ August & Kabat

12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90025

Tel: (310) 826-7474

Fax: (310) 826-6991

Attorneys for Patent Owner-

Cross-Appellant Corephotonics, Ltd.

NO. 22-2288

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

APPLE INC.,
Appellant
v.

COREPHOTONICS, LTD.,
Cross-Appellant

On Appeal from the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in
Inter Partes Review No. IPR2020-00489

POTENTIAL OTHER CONFLICTS IN PENDING CASES

- *Apple Inc. v. Corephotonics, Ltd.* Case Nos. 22-1325, -1327.